

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Senate Executive Committee
Minutes
Monday, February 2, 2015

Present: Chair Roy Campbell, Vice Chair Kim Graber, Abbas Aminmansour, Nicholas Burbules, John Hart, Matthew Hill, Prasanta Kalita, Calvin Lear, Melissa Madsen, William Maher, Mary Mallory, Gay Miller, David O'Brien, Michael Sandretto, Kevin Seymour, Joyce Tolliver

Guests: Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Ilesanmi Adesida, Carle Representative Joseph Barkmeier, Professor Rohit Bhargava, Professor Neal Cohen, Associate Provost Katherine Galvin, Equal Opportunity and Inclusion Committee Chair Harry Hilton, Professor Eric Johnson, Associate Chancellor for Public Affairs Robin Kaler, Faculty and Academic Staff Benefits Committee Chair John Kindt, Campus Faculty Associate Representative Richard Laugesen, Professor Ben McCall, Professor Norman Paquin, Professor Kirk Sanders, Vice Chancellor for Research Peter Schiffer

Media: Daily Illini – Abigale Svoboda, Inside Illinois – Mike Henthal, News-Gazette – Julie Wurth, WDWS – Tim Ditman

A regular meeting of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) was called to order at 3:10 pm on Monday, February 2, 2015 in 232 English Building, with Chair Campbell presiding.

1. Introduction

Introductions were made.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes from December 1, 2014 were approved as distributed.

3. Chair's Remarks

Chair Campbell suggested discussing the proposed College of Medicine (COM) earlier in the agenda to accommodate the guests in attendance to speak in support of the COM. Committees members agreed. Chair Campbell also noted that the February 9 Senate agenda is very full and time will need to be monitored to complete the entire agenda. Chair Campbell also mentioned the anticipated budget reduction proposed by Governor Rauner and that changes will continue to come.

4. Chancellor's Remarks

Provost Adesida reported that Governor Rauner visited Champaign-Urbana and spoke about minimizing waste while improving quality and excellence at Illinois. Illinois must realize how to become an economic engine for the state.

5. Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee Final Report

Johnson, Chair of the Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee, noted that under existing current faculty hiring procedures potential faculty are reviewed at the department and college level and the hiring recommendation then goes to the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Chancellor. Months later the Board of Trustees (BOT) approves the faculty hires. The review committee recommends that the BOT delegate hiring authority to the campus. Hiring decisions for those at the level of Dean and above would still be directly approved at the Board level. The issue is about the BOT reviewing the employment recommendation months after a faculty member has already begun working. A delay in approval of faculty appointments may negatively impact competitiveness.

The current BOT schedule and availability makes it difficult to gain BOT approval prior to a desired start date for faculty. The review committee concluded that it is not workable to have the BOT approve faculty hires months after the faculty begin working.

Several questions were raised regarding the BOT delegating hiring authority to the campuses. Committee members came to the consensus that the SEC should discuss endorsing the Hiring Policies and Procedures Review Committee Report. A formal motion was made to include the hiring report as a report for information on the February 9 Senate agenda and SEC would discuss endorsing the hiring report at the March 2 SEC meeting for inclusion on the March 9 Senate agenda.

6. AFT Final Report on the Investigation into the Matter of Steven Salaita

O'Brien noted that the Committee devoted more time to determining Salaita's status vis-à-vis the University than any other aspect of the report. Salaita was somewhere between an applicant and employee. The AAUP (American Association of University Professors) would most likely argue that Salaita was an employee and that he would be due a hearing for dismissal with cause. Some members of the AFT disagreed and thought the language on the hiring letter noting the offer was pending BOT approval meant Salaita was not an employee. On the other hand the AFT argued that Salaita should be granted the academic freedom normally accorded to faculty and that if a person enjoys academic freedom, then one cannot consider their political viewpoints in matters of employment. O'Brien noted that the AFT committee was looking for a way to work with everyone on the committee to come to a consensus and stated that Dr. Salaita's academic freedom was grossly violated. O'Brien state that the AFT felt the report was explicit that Dr. Salaita's academic freedom was violated, but some of the feedback that AFT received indicated that this point was not explicit and the AFT plans to issue a clarification. O'Brien added that AFT members Steinberg and Higgins attended the first meeting, where they recused themselves, and the final one, when the report was explained to them. They in no way influenced the findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the report.

In response to a question regarding only employees being eligible to request review by the AFT, O'Brien responded that, according to the University *Statutes* and the *Bylaws* of the Senate AFT is supposed to investigate matters where "significant allegations" of the violation of academic freedom or shared governance have been made. There have been possibly more such allegation surrounding this matter than any other in the history of the University. O'Brien responded to the opinion that remanding the Salaita hiring decision to the college was a moot point by noting that the AAUP could still sanction the university, Board, or any faculty members. O'Brien noted that if the University followed the AFT's recommendations, they could avoid censure.

7. Board of Trustees Approval of Faculty Appointments

Human Resources (HR) distributed an email reiterating the BOT ruling requiring BOT approval prior to any employment offers to tenure system faculty. HR is working on the timelines and policies surrounding the BOT ruling.

In response to a question regarding background checks, Adesida noted that background checks have been common practice, but the new policy would require background checks across the board. Chair Campbell suggested that various Senate committees should review the new background policy. Committees suggested included AFT and Equal Opportunity and Access. Galvin noted that a policy on University criminal background checks was being finalized. Campuses would then develop procedures to implement the policy at each campus. The Urbana campus currently has a background check policy in place for security sensitive positions. Those included on the committee addressing background checks would include faculty, HR representatives, the University Police, and other key stakeholders.

8. Proposal to Create a College of Medicine in Partnership with Carle Health System

Chair of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (EPC) Miller noted her pleasure that the proposal to establish a College of Medicine was approved unanimously by the EPC. The Senate Committee on University Statutes and Senate Procedures (USSP) and the Senate Committee on the Budget have also considered the College of Medicine proposal.

Adesida thanked the involved Senate committees for their diligent work. The proposed College of Medicine (COM) will bring better health care for society. Illinois has the ability and the opportunity to lead in medicine of the future. Adesida added that there are numerous letters of support for the COM.

Cohen noted his own work on amnesia and traumatic brain injury, and that grants secured for his work often send part of this grant funding to other institutions because Illinois does not have its own COM. With a COM Cohen's grant funding would stay at Illinois and his research would directly benefit the local community. Cohen gave his full endorsement and support of the proposed COM.

Bhargava discussed the Cancer Community at Illinois and how it started as a grassroots word-of-mouth movement. The Cancer Community works to improve prevention, detection, and diagnosis of cancer. Cancer will inflict 1 in 2 people. About half a million will succumb to the disease. There are 14 million survivors and are not sure if they will get it again. The Cancer Community received a \$2 million grant from NIH and has been working with many institutions around the world except Urbana. The COM will not make Illinois solely a medical institution, but is not solely a social science or engineering institution either. There are a lot of students wanting to get involved with health and the COM could provide that opportunity. In three years the Cancer Community has come a long way, but it can only go further with the COM.

Barkmeier noted that Carle has committed \$100 million to the proposed COM. Carle has over 850,000 visits per year, over 70,000 emergency room visits, and deliver more babies than most other hospitals in the state of Illinois. Carle is in the top 100 hospitals in the country and in the top 15 in the state of Illinois. Carle is the only hospital outside of the Chicagoland area that is in the top 15. Physicians at Carle are excited about the partnership with the proposed COM and the opportunities for research that the COM would bring. The COM partnership would help Carle attract a higher level of physician. Carle's cancer center is one of 36 recognized by the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

EPC Chair Miller added that there are numerous people working on the COM proposal and that a letter of support from all 15 deans was recently received and is included with the COM proposal.

In response to a comment on the lack of emphasis on the quality of healthcare in the proposal, Barkmeier responded that there will be billions of dollars of positive impact on the community and not just Illinois or Carle. This partnership will help get medical information out for teaching patients, but also to prevent readmissions and save lives.

Miller noted that there are still more steps in the process of creating the COM. Hiring a dean would be one of the first tasks so that a curriculum and bylaws could then be created. The COM would also have to go through accreditation process. Adesida noted that the immediate next steps would be to gain the approval of the Senate, the University Senates Conference, the President, and the BOT. After all of those approvals, a dean could be hired.

Mallory suggested that the presenters of the COM proposal be prepared to answer questions about how Illinois compares to other institutions with a COM that are mostly in major metropolitan areas and also how Illinois compares to what the Chicago campus is already doing. Barkmeier noted that there was a small town in Iowa that with a medical center really made the town grow.

9. Open Access to Research Articles

Committee members suggested the Open Access to Research Articles should be referred to the Senate Committee on General University Policy and the Senate Committee on the Library.

10. Setting of the Senate Agenda

Chair Campbell made suggested time limits on each Senate agenda item, but noted that only the Senate can impose rules on itself and if the Senate chooses to do so it requires a two-thirds vote.

Committee members agreed that time limits should be suggested to the Senate in order to complete as much business as possible.

Some committee members were unclear on what proposal LB.15.01 was asking the Senate to endorse. Chair of the Senate Committee on the Library Mallory noted that the proposal was to endorse the proposal and not the appendices. Mallory will make this clear at the Senate meeting when the proposal is introduced.

McCall noted that RS.15.06 and RS.15.07 would replace the postponed RS.15.04 as long as RS.15.06 and RS.15.07 appear on the February 9 Senate agenda. The SEC placed RS.15.06 and RS.15.07 on the February 9 Senate agenda and McCall, on behalf of the majority of the sponsors, withdrew RS.15.04.

Lear moved approval of the February 9, 2015 Senate agenda as amended, O'Brien seconded, and the February 9 Senate agenda was approved as amended.

11. New Business

None.

12. Announcements/Verbal Reports for Information

None.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:57pm.

Jenny Roether
Clerk of the Senate